

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/666,836	Applicant(s) ANDERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Ethan C. Whisenant	Art Unit 1634	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Ethan C. Whisenant. (3) John Tarcza. 33638
 (2) Frank Lu. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 25 June 2002 .

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: applicant showed their tubes and described the differences between theirs and microtubes / eppendorf tubes .

Claim(s) discussed: pending .

Identification of prior art discussed: _____ .


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see the attached .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

- i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


ETHAN C. WHISENANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Discussed the possibility of a declaration wherein the applicant would define the range of ultracentrifugation in order to distinguish over the prior art. In addition, the applicant suggested structural limitations to further define their tube over microfuge tubes/eppendorf tubes. The applicant agreed to file a continuation so that the declaration / new limitations can be considered.